Accreditation Report Format for 2007-08 Reports

Overview of this Report
As part of the review and revision of the Accreditation System, the format of the Accreditation Site Visit Reports has been discussed. At the June COA meeting, a discussion was held on the attributes that should be included in the site visit report and staff agreed to return with a proposed template for the 2007-08 reports.

Staff Recommendation
To adopt the revised report format for all 2007-08 accreditation site visit reports.

Background
The proposed format for the site visit reports is based on the format used previously but adds a few new components and works to standardize the report format.

Summary Tables:
The proposed report template has two summary tables at the beginning of the report. The first table details the team's findings on the Common Standards, standard by standard. The second table summarizes each of the approved programs offered by the institution/program sponsor. Each approved program will be listed, the total number of standards that apply to that type of program and the team's findings for the program: How many of the standards were 'Met,' 'Met with Concerns,' or 'Not Met.'

The COA also directed staff to add a statement that the preparation for the visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the COA and only describe the specifics if something unusual occurred. This will make the introductory text, included in the COA agenda item but not the report itself, briefer and allow information related to the institution/program sponsor to be included in the report for the institution/program sponsor.

Template Text for CTC Staff:
There are a number of 'shadow' boxed comments on the template that follows. These are provided for CTC staff use to assist in developing consistent, clear site visit reports and will not be present when the report is presented to the COA.

Proposed Template for

Accreditation Site Visit Reports
2007-08

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at "Insert Institution Name Here"

Insert Date Here

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at "Insert Institution Name Here". The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the attached report, the accreditation recommendation is "Insert Accreditation Recommendation here".

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor

Common Standards

	Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
1) Education Leadership			
2) Resources			
3) Faculty			
4) Evaluation			
5) Admission			
6) Advice and Assistance			
7) School Collaboration			
8) District Field Supervisors			

Program Standards

	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject	21	19	2	0
Single Subject	21	20	1	0
Education Specialist: MM	17	17	0	0
Administrative Services				
List all programs offered by the Institution/program sponsor				

The following was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Note to Staff:

If anything unusual took place with respect to the preparation for the visit, the selection, composition or arrival of the team members, the interviews or site visits or the preparation of the team report, please describe the unusual activity or events here.

Begin the Team Report on the next page.

Institution: **"Insert Institution Name here"**

Dates of Visit: **"Insert dates of site visit here"**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **"Insert Accreditation Recommendation here"**

Following are the stipulations:

Insert Stipulations Here

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of "Insert Accreditation Recommendation here" was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards—

Address specifics related to the findings on the Common Standards. If any standards were found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met, include the rationale here.

   Program Standards –

Summarize the program standard findings here. Identify the programs where standards were less than fully met, but leave the specifics to the program report section later.

2. Overall Recommendation –

Provide the rationale here for the team's recommendation for an accreditation decision.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

List all approved credential programs here

Administrative Services Credential
        Preliminary

Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary Level I
   Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Professional Level II
   Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Multiple Subject Credential
      Multiple Subject
      Multiple Subject Internship

Pupil Personnel Services Credential
      School Counseling

Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
      Reading Certificate

Single Subject Credential
      Single Subject Credential
      Single Subject Internship

(2)   Staff recommends that:

   •   The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted

   •   "Insert Institution Name here" be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

   •   "Insert Institution Name here" be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the "Insert Year here" academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Team Leader: **First Last Name**
                                          Institution

Common Standards Cluster:

                                          First Last Name
                                          Institution

                                          Repeat for all Cluster Members

Basic Credential Programs Cluster: **First Last Name,** Cluster Leader
                                          Institution

                                          Repeat for all Cluster Members

Advanced/Services Programs   **First Last Name,** Cluster Leader
Cluster: Institution

Repeat for all Cluster Members

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog   Field Experience Notebooks
Institutional Self Study   Schedule of Classes
Course Syllabi   Advisement Documents
Candidate Files   Faculty Vitae
Fieldwork Handbooks   College Annual Report
Follow-up Survey Results   College Budget Plan
Needs Analysis Results

Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic Credential Cluster	Advanced Credential Cluster	**TOTAL**
Program Faculty					
Institutional Administration					
Candidates					
Graduates					
Employers of Graduates					
Supervising Practitioners					
Advisors					
School Administrators					
Credential Analysts and Staff					
Advisory Committee					

Add additional rows if needed   **TOTAL**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background information

Provide background information about the institution/program sponsor including the geographic location, size, student demographics, history, and any unique information about this institution/program sponsor.

Education Unit

Provide basic information about the education unit. How many departments? Or Schools are included in the unit? How many candidates are enrolled? How many credential are awarded, and how many faculty? Complete Table 1 to list all approved programs, candidates enrolled and entity reviewing the program—will usually be CTC.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)
Multiple Subject				
List all programs offered				

The visit

A brief summary of the visit describing where the school visits took place, total number of team members, began and ended.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Standard Finding Decision
Standard Met
Standard Met with Concerns
Standard Not Met

Findings Section:

Delete the Standard Findings that do not apply to this standard.

Team needs to write paragraphs about the standard…think about one short paragraph per sentence or group of sentences of the standard.

Capture the essence of the institution and what was seen, heard and discovered by the team.

Do not identify individual faculty, staff or students by name or specific role designation.

A standard can be 'Met' and there can still be areas for growth below.

Rationale

If a Standard is 'Met with Concerns' or 'Not Met' a **rationale** must be provided that summarizes the concern and the evidence that lead to the team's decision. If the Standard is 'Met' the Rationale section is deleted.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation

Note specific strengths that were identified by the team

Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation

Note specific issues that are not already noted above in the Findings section. An area that is discussed here is not significant enough to cause a standard to be less than fully met. IF the standard is "Met with Concerns' or 'Not Met' due to this issue, it will be discussed above in the standard finding section.

Repeat for each of the Common Standards
See Sample Reports for possible language related to each of the 8 Common Standards. If appropriate, begin each Common Standard on a new page.

Multiple Subject Credential and
Multiple Subject Internship Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Multiple Subject Programs:

OR

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Multiple Subject Programs except for the following:

Standard X: Standard name - Met with Concerns

Address all concerns identified and provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is less than fully met

Standard X: Standard Name - Not Met

Provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is Not Met.
There is no convincing evidence that Elements A, B, C, and F were addressed.

Strengths in Program Implementation

Identify strengths the team found in the program. Do not identify individual faculty, staff or students by name or specific role designation.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation

Identify the issues, not already described above in the Findings section, that need to be addressed by the institution/program sponsor but did not lead to a standard being less than fully met. Do not identify individual faculty, staff or students by name or specific role designation.

Repeat for all Approved Programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor
Team may 'group' programs that fit together logically based on the adopted standards and the local program implementation. If appropriate, begin each new program or group of programs on a new page.

Professional Comments

Professional Comments are issues, concerns or strengths that were raised during the visit but do not DIRECTLY apply to the adopted standards. *Professional Comments* are NOT part of the accreditation report and are not binding on the institution/program sponsor. Not all programs will have *Professional Comments*. No one individual or small group of individuals should be identified in the comment.

Common Standards

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Single Subject Credential Program

Education Specialist
.

Repeat for all approved programs for which the team has Professional Comments.
Usually the comments are put in the same order as the program reports were presented.